

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-41 have been examined and are rejected. In the above amendments, claims 1-4, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-18, 21, 22, 27-35, 40 and 41 have been amended. Therefore, after entry of the above amendments, claims 1-41 will be pending in this application. Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Damnjanovic *et al* (U.S. 2003/0050084) in view of Eibling *et al* (U.S. 6,609,007).

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites:

“A method for controlling power in a wireless communication system having multiple reverse-link communication channels, the method comprising:

adjusting power levels of a first set of channels and a corresponding pilot channel according to a fixed ratio, the first set of channels including at least one traffic channel; and

adjusting one or more traffic-to-pilot (T/P) ratios for one or more additional traffic channels independently of the power level of the pilot channel, the adjusting power levels and the adjusting one or more T/P ratios being performed by a single base station for a single mobile station.”

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Damnjanovic in view of Eibling for at least the following reasons.

First, the combination of Damnjanovic and Eibling does not disclose “adjusting power levels of a first set of channels and a corresponding pilot channel according to a fixed ratio ... and adjusting one or more traffic-to-pilot (T/P) ratios for one or more additional traffic channels independently of the power level of the pilot channel,” as recited in claim 1.

Damnjanovic describes a first embodiment in which “the reverse rate control channel has a fixed offset relative to the reverse pilot channel, while the reverse traffic channel has a variable offset.” (See paragraph 0072, lines 8-11.) Damnjanovic also describes a second embodiment in which “the gain of the reverse traffic channel is fixed relative to the reverse pilot channel. The gain of the reverse rate control channel is allowed to vary relative to the

reverse pilot channel power.” (See paragraph 0088, lines 4-8.) Damnjanovic thus describes adjusting the offsets/gains of a traffic channel and a rate control channel. Damnjanovic does not disclose (i) adjusting the power level of a first set of channels (which includes at least one traffic channel) . . . according to a fixed ratio and (ii) adjusting one or more T/P ratios for one or more additional traffic channels independently, as recited in claim 1.

Second, the combination of Damnjanovic and Eibling does not disclose “the adjusting power levels and the adjusting one or more T/P ratios being performed by a single base station for a single mobile station,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, Damnjanovic states “in the first embodiment, . . . the serving base station 12 power controls the pilot channel and the reverse rate control channel . . . The non-serving base stations 12 power control the reverse traffic channel.” (See paragraph 0073, lines 1-5.) Damnjanovic further states “in the second embodiment, the serving base station 12 controls the rate control channel transmit power. The non-serving base stations 12 control the reverse pilot power and reverse traffic channel power.” (See paragraph 0089, lines 1-5.) Damnjanovic thus describes different base stations controlling the offsets/gains of the traffic channel and the rate control channel. In contrast, claim 1 recites a single base station performing the power level adjusting and the T/P ratio adjusting.

Third, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Damnjanovic and Eibling. Damnjanovic describes power control for reverse link channels. Eibling describes power control for forward link channels. (See the title, abstract, and specification of Eibling.) Power control works differently for the reverse link and forward link. For example, Eibling describes using a single multiplier **290** in FIG. 2 to adjust the signals sent on the forward link to all mobile stations. On the reverse link, the signals to be power controlled are sent by different mobile stations. Thus, there is no apparent motivation to combine Damnjanovic and Eibling.

Furthermore, Eibling states “base station **200** then adjusts the power level of the signal to the mobile terminal accordingly, prior to the signal being summed in combiner **230.**” (See column 6, lines 8-10.) Eibling thus describes adjusting the transmit power of a single signal for a mobile terminal.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Damnjanovic in view of Eibling. Claims 2-15 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons noted for base claim 1.

Independent claims 16 and 30 have each been amended to recite the features noted above for claim 1. Claims 17-29 are dependent on claim 16, and claims 31-41 are dependent on claim 30. Claim 16-41 are patentable over Damnjanovic in view of Eibling for at least the reasons noted for claim 1.

Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-41 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 24, 2008

By: /Rupit Patel/

Rupit Patel, Reg. No. 53441
Phone No. 858-651-7435

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502